

## **REMARKS**

### **Claim Rejections**

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sungberg (U.S. 5,179,765). Claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hirzel (U.S. 5,214,825). Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by King et al. (U.S. 4,671,935). Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over King et al. in view of Hirzel. Claims 4 and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### **Drawings**

It is noted that the Examiner has accepted the drawings as originally filed with this application.

### **Claim Amendments**

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 4 and 9, amended claims 1 and 5 and added new claims 10-11 to this application. It is believed that the new and amended claims specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 4 and 9 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form. Applicant's amended claim 1 comprises a combination of original claims 1 and 4, thus redrafting claim 4 in independent form. Original claims 2 and 3 and new claim 10 each depend from amended claim 1. Applicant's amended claim 5 comprises a combination of original claims 5 and 9, thus redrafting claim 9 in independent form. Original claims 6-8 and new claim 11 all depend from amended claim 5. In the absence of any art cited against Applicant's original claims 4 or 9, it is not believed that any detailed discussion of the cited prior art references is necessary. Suffice to say that all of the claims remaining in this patent application contain subject matter against which no prior art citations have been made.

**Summary**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 7, 2005

By:

  
Bruce H. Troxell  
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC  
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404  
Falls Church, Virginia 22041  
Telephone: 703 575-2711  
Telefax: 703 575-2707